



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,427	07/01/2003	Joseph M. Hanners	60027.0330US01/BS030153	6510
23552 7590 07/08/2008 MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
EXAMINER				
DENNISON, JERRY B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2143				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/08/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,427

Applicant(s)

HANNERS ET AL.

Examiner

J. Bret Dennison

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/4/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This Action is in response to the Amendment for Application Number 10/612,427 received on 4/04/2008.
2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination. Claim 21 has been newly added.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 04/04/2008 have been carefully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments are deemed moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., *by incorporating new limitations into the independent claims, which required further search and consideration*) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.
4. From the rejection provided herein, it is shown that Applicant has not distinguished the claimed invention from well known methods and systems in the prior art using the "screen scraping" technique. From reading Applicant's Specification, it appears that Applicant's actual invention pertains to the detection of errors due to host screen changes and presenting these errors to the user in an errors file [see Applicant's Specification, page 2, lines 20-28].
5. It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art.
6. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends

Art Unit: 2143

broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (U.S. 5,958,013) in view of Brawn (6,182,276).

8. Regarding claim 1, King disclosed a method of managing a host session on a remote computer in a computer system, the method comprising:

sending a request to establish the host session from a client computer (King, col. 12, lines 10-11, King disclosed the user initiating a session with a host; col. 12, lines 36-38, King disclosed the data stream sent to the host), the request including a presentation space (King, col. 12, lines 14-16, King disclosed instantiating the session object also instantiates the presentation space object),

receiving in the presentation space a response to the request from the remote computer, the response including host screen data (King, col. 12, lines 45-50, King disclosed the host modifying the host screen data in the presentation space object and returning it to the client);

King did not explicitly state wherein the client computer has access to a plurality of properties files defining a plurality of screens for the host session;

identifying the response by comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session, wherein the screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write; and performing an action based on the identified response.

In an analogous art, Brawn disclosed a technique for host application presentation space recognition in which screen data for presentation spaces are defined at the client computer (Brawn, col. 6, lines 10-15) in which the user can specify attributes for each screen of interest (Brawn, col. 6, lines 43-60), the attributes including six different attribute types (Brawn, col. 7, lines 29-34) including specified fields to be searched for (Brawn, Fig. 3, elements 150, 160, 170, 180, 190, 200), which clearly require names, i.e. identifiers of the types of fields to be searched for. Brawn also disclosed a type of identifier assigned to a collection of attributes that have been used to define a particular screen, i.e. a screen name (Brawn, col. 7, lines 20-29). Therefore, it can be seen from these citations that Brawn disclosed wherein the user's computer has access to a plurality of properties files defining a plurality of screens for a host session, and such data is used to recognize a particular screen of interest to the user, and upon

detecting a particular screen, performing "scrape" functions to obtain the data from the presentation and reformat it for display (Brawn, col. 3, lines 45-61).

The teachings of King and Brawn are analogous art because they both disclose the teachings of a communication session between a host and client using terminal emulation information in terms of 3270 data streaming applications which use screen-type user interfaces to display and receive data (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Brawn, col. 6, lines 30-40).

While King provides for establishing a session and the transfer of presentation space/screen data, King also suggests methods for extracting the presentation space data (King, col. 10, lines 54-56). Brawn provides a method for extracting the presentation space data in a more efficient way of handling this received data, specified to the user's interest (Brawn, col. 6, lines 45-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate screen data extraction teachings of Brawn into the teachings of King to provide users with an improved technique for extracting complex data components from the host screen data or presentation spaces and provide an efficient, easy to use solution for receiving and processing presentation spaces from legacy host applications that are formatted for obsolete character-based terminals, thereby not requiring the user to include code to monitor host data streams for presentation spaces, thereby providing a more efficient emulation process for the user with less worries about the programming side (Brawn, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 10).

9. Regarding claim 2, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the plurality of properties files includes at least one screen properties file for defining the screen data for the host session (Brawn, col. 7, lines 1-5). See motivation above.

10. Regarding claim 3, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 2, including wherein the at least one screen properties file comprises a responses section (Brawn, col. 3, lines 45-60, upon detecting a presentation space, an output is created based on the attributes). See motivation above.

11. Regarding claim 4, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 3, including wherein the responses section comprises:

12. a response type for the response (Brawn, col. 7, lines 29-35, attribute types); and

13. identifying text for the response (Brawn, col. 7, lines 40-45). See motivation above.

14. Regarding claim 5, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 4, including wherein the response type is one of success, analyze, and reject (Brawn, col. 3, lines 45-60, upon detecting a presentation space of interest, an output is created based on the attributes). See motivation above.

15. Regarding claim 6, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 4, including wherein identifying the response by comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises determining the response type for the response by comparing the host screen data to the identifying text defined for the response in the responses section of the at least one screen properties file (Brawn, col. 7, lines 40-50). See motivation above.

16. Regarding claim 8, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the plurality of properties files are Java properties files (King, col. 7, lines 5-10). See motivation above.

17. Regarding claim 9, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the host session is a TN3270 host session (King, col. 6, lines 30-37). See motivation above.

18. Regarding claim 10, King disclosed a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for managing a host session between a client computer and a remote computer in a computer system, comprising:

a program file for, sending a request to establish the host session (King, col. 12, lines 10-11, King disclosed the user initiating a session with a host; col. 12, lines 36-38,

Art Unit: 2143

King disclosed the data stream sent to the host), the request including a presentation space (King, col. 12, lines 14-16, King disclosed instantiating the session object also instantiates the presentation space object);

receiving in the presentation space a response to the request from the remote computer, the response including host screen data (King, col. 12, lines 45-50, King disclosed the host modifying the host screen data in the presentation space object and returning it to the client);

King did not explicitly state wherein the computer-readable medium comprises:

a plurality of properties files for defining a plurality of screens comprising screen data for the host session, wherein the screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write; and

and a program file for:

identifying a response type for the response, wherein the response type is defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files; and

performing an action based on the response type.

In an analogous art, Brawn disclosed a technique for host application presentation space recognition in which screen data for presentation spaces are defined at the client computer (Brawn, col. 6, lines 10-15) in which the user can specify attributes for each screen of interest (Brawn, col. 6, lines 43-60), the attributes including six different attribute types (Brawn, col. 7, lines 29-34) including specified fields to be

searched for (Brawn, Fig. 3, elements 150, 160, 170, 180, 190, 200), which clearly require names, i.e. identifiers of the types of fields to be searched for. Brawn also disclosed a type of identifier assigned to a collection of attributes that have been used to define a particular screen, i.e. a screen name as well as attribute types (Brawn, col. 7, lines 20-29). Therefore, it can be seen from these teachings that Brawn disclosed wherein the user's computer has access to a plurality of properties files defining a plurality of screens for a host session, and such data is used to recognize a particular screen of interest to the user, and upon detecting a particular screen, performing "scrape" functions to obtain the data from the presentation and reformat it for display (Brawn, col. 3, lines 45-61).

The teachings of King and Brawn are analogous art because they both disclose the teachings of a communication session between a host and client using terminal emulation information in terms of 3270 data streaming applications which use screen-type user interfaces to display and receive data (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Brawn, col. 6, lines 30-40).

While King provides for establishing a session and the transfer of presentation space/screen data, King also suggests methods for extracting the presentation space data (King, col. 10, lines 54-56). Brawn provides a method for extracting the presentation space data in a more efficient way of handling this received data, specified to the user's interest (Brawn, col. 6, lines 45-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate screen data extraction teachings of Brawn

into the teachings of King to provide users with an improved technique for extracting complex data components from the host screen data or presentation spaces and provide an efficient, easy to use solution for receiving and processing presentation spaces from legacy host applications that are formatted for obsolete character-based terminals, thereby not requiring the user to include code to monitor host data streams for presentation spaces, thereby providing a more efficient emulation process for the user with less worries about the programming side (Brawn, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 10).

19. Regarding claim 11, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the plurality of properties files includes at least one screen properties file for defining the screen data for the host session (Brawn, col. 7, lines 1-5). See motivation above.

20. Regarding claim 12, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 11, including wherein the at least one screen properties file comprises a responses section (Brawn, col. 3, lines 45-60, upon detecting a presentation space, an output is created based on the attributes). See motivation above.

21. Regarding claim 13, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 12, including wherein the responses section comprises identifying text for the response (Brawn, col. 7, lines 40-45). See motivation above.

22. Regarding claim 14, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 13, including wherein identifying a response type for the response comprises comparing the host screen data to the identifying text defined for the response in the responses section of the at least one screen properties file (Brawn, col. 7, lines 40-50). See motivation above.

23. Regarding claim 15, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the response type is one of success, analyze, and reject (Brawn, col. 3, lines 45-60, upon detecting a presentation space of interest, an output is created based on the attributes). See motivation above.

24. Regarding claim 17, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the plurality of properties files are Java properties files (King, col. 7, lines 5-10). See motivation above.

25. Regarding claim 18, King and Brawn disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the host session is a TN3270 host session (King, col. 6, lines 30-37). See motivation above.

26. Regarding claim 19, King disclosed a computer system for managing a host session, comprising:

a remote computer in the computer system (King, Fig. 5, 140, host computer);
and

a client computer, in communication with the remote computer (Fig. 5, 532, user computer),

the client computer comprising:

a memory device for storing a program file (King, col. 7, lines 45-55, col. 8, lines 17-20, King disclosed the client computer running the terminal emulation program which clearly is located in the client computer's memory); and

a processor, functionally coupled to the memory device (King, col. 7, lines 45-55, CPU), the processor being responsive to computer-executable instructions contained in the program file stored in the memory device and operative to:

send a request to the remote computer to establish the host session (King, col. 12, lines 10-11, King disclosed the user initiating a session with a host; col. 12, lines 36-38, King disclosed the data stream sent to the host), the request including a presentation space (King, col. 12, lines 14-16, King disclosed instantiating the session object also instantiates the presentation space object);
and

receive in the presentation space a response to the request from the remote computer, the response including host screen data (King, col. 12, lines

45-50, King disclosed the host modifying the host screen data in the presentation space object and returning it to the client);

King did not explicitly state wherein the client computer includes a plurality of properties files for defining a plurality of screens comprising screen data for the host session wherein the screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write;

identifying a response type for the response, wherein the response type is defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files; and
performing an action based on the response type.

In an analogous art, Brawn disclosed a technique for host application presentation space recognition in which screen data for presentation spaces are defined at the client computer (Brawn, col. 6, lines 10-15) in which the user can specify attributes for each screen of interest (Brawn, col. 6, lines 43-60), the attributes including six different attribute types (Brawn, col. 7, lines 29-34) including specified fields, to be searched for (Brawn, Fig. 3, elements 150, 160, 170, 180, 190, 200), which clearly require names, i.e. identifiers of the types of fields to be searched for. Brawn also disclosed a type of identifier assigned to a collection of attributes that have been used to define a particular screen, i.e. a screen name as well as attribute types (Brawn, col. 7, lines 20-29). Therefore, it can be seen from these teachings that Brawn disclosed wherein the user's computer has access to a plurality of properties files defining a

plurality of screens for a host session, and such data is used to recognize a particular screen of interest to the user, and upon detecting a particular screen, performing "scrape" functions to obtain the data from the presentation and reformat it for display (Brawn, col. 3, lines 45-61).

The teachings of King and Brawn are analogous art because they both disclose the teachings of a communication session between a host and client using terminal emulation information in terms of 3270 data streaming applications which use screen-type user interfaces to display and receive data (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Brawn, col. 6, lines 30-40).

While King provides for establishing a session and the transfer of presentation space/screen data, King also suggests methods for extracting the presentation space data (King, col. 10, lines 54-56). Brawn provides a method for extracting the presentation space data in a more efficient way of handling this received data, specified to the user's interest (Brawn, col. 6, lines 45-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate screen data extraction teachings of Brawn into the teachings of King to provide users with an improved technique for extracting complex data components from the host screen data or presentation spaces and provide an efficient, easy to use solution for receiving and processing presentation spaces from legacy host applications that are formatted for obsolete character-based terminals, thereby not requiring the user to include code to monitor host data streams for presentation spaces, thereby providing a more efficient emulation process for the

Art Unit: 2143

user with less worries about the programming side (Brawn, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 10).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 20-21 are allowed.

The prior art did not disclose, in addition to the rest of the claim limitations of the independent claims, if the response type is reject, then printing the presentation space to an errors file.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure

relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571) 272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2143

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. B. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 2143

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2143